

The Asian American Medical Association has always been a great asset to Northwest Indiana. Its members have selflessly dedicated themselves to providing quality medical service to the residents of Indiana's First Congressional District, and they have always demonstrated exemplary service through their many cultural, scholastic, and charitable endeavors.

At this year's charity ball, the Asian American Medical Association will present the Crystal Globe Award to one of Northwest Indiana's finest citizens, Mr. Gary Mitchell, President and CEO of Opportunity Enterprises, Inc., a non-profit organization that serves to create opportunities for individuals with unique challenges and abilities. From the beginning, social work was not only a career choice for Gary but a way of life. Focused on his calling, Gary graduated from Ball State University with a bachelor's degree in social work and went on to receive his master's degree in social work from Indiana University. After college, Gary held many positions in the social service field, and he also has years of experience in business and industry.

In 1986, Gary joined the team at Opportunity Enterprises as the Chief Executive Officer. Opportunity Enterprises has enjoyed unprecedented success under Gary's leadership. The company has continued to grow and expand. In 1986, the organization served 263 individuals with disabilities on a daily basis. Since then, Opportunity Enterprises has shown immense growth and now serves over 1,000 individuals. Gary has made it his goal to provide day services, residential programs, and vocational opportunities for individuals of all ages, whether they have physical, emotional, or developmental disabilities. For the past 15 years, Opportunity Enterprises has received the three-year accreditation for the Commission on Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities (CARF), a not-for-profit organization that establishes standards of quality for service to people with disabilities. In addition, for his efforts on behalf of his community, Gary has received numerous honors, including the President's Award in 1992 and the Sagamore of the Wabash in 1993 from then-Governor of Indiana, EVAN BAYH. For his selfless and passionate support for helping individuals to re-establish their roles in community life, Gary is to be commended and admired. He is truly an inspiration.

Gary's dedication to the people he serves is matched only by his devotion to his family. Gary has been married to his wife, Paula, for 42 years. They have three children and seven grandchildren.

Madam Speaker, I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in commending the Asian American Medical Association, as well as this year's Crystal Globe Award recipient, Mr. Gary Mitchell, for their outstanding contributions to their communities and beyond. Their unwavering commitment to improving the quality of life for the people of Northwest Indiana and throughout the United States is truly inspirational. For these reasons, the Asian American Medical Association, its members, and Mr. Mitchell are to be recognized, and I am proud to serve as their representative in Washington, D.C.

# INTRODUCTION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DISTRICT ATTORNEY ESTABLISHMENT ACT OF 2009

## HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, November 3, 2009*

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, today I introduce the District of Columbia District Attorney Establishment Act of 2009, continuing a series of bills that I will introduce this session to ensure a continuation of the process of the transition to full democracy and self-government for the residents of the District of Columbia. This bill is the seventh in our "Free and Equal D.C." series of bills to eliminate anti-Home Rule legislation and to remedy obsolete or inappropriate congressional laws to the local affairs of the District of Columbia or denials of federal benefits or recognition routinely granted to other jurisdictions.

This bill would establish an Office of District Attorney for the District of Columbia, to be headed by a district attorney elected by D.C. residents. This bill would effectuate the November 2002 referendum in which D.C. voters overwhelmingly (82 percent) approved a locally elected District Attorney.

This important legislation is designed to put the District of Columbia on par with every other local jurisdiction in the country by allowing D.C. residents to elect an independent district attorney to prosecute local criminal and civil matters now handled by the U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia, a federal official. Under this bill, the new, locally elected district attorney would become the city's chief legal officer. The United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia would remain and, like other U.S. Attorneys' offices in the U.S., would handle only the federal matters under its jurisdiction. As presently constituted, the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District is the largest in the country only because it serves mainly as the local city prosecutor. The U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia needs to be freed up to handle national security and other vital federal cases, particularly in the post-9/11 nation's capital.

There is no law enforcement issue of greater importance to our residents, or on which we have less say, than the prosecution of local crimes here. A U.S. Attorney has no business in the local criminal affairs of a local jurisdiction. This bill simply would make the District's prosecutor accountable to the people by electing him or her, as elsewhere in the nation.

In addition to issues of democracy and self-government, such as congressional voting rights and legislative and budget autonomy, that District residents are entitled to as American citizens, residents are determined to achieve each and every other element of home rule. Amending the District's Home Rule Act to create a local district attorney position would be an important development toward our goal of achieving true self-government. I urge my colleagues to support this important measure.

# CHINESE HUMAN RIGHTS ATTORNEYS TESTIFY BEFORE THE TOM LANTOS HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

## HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, November 3, 2009*

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to the following testimonies of two Chinese human rights attorneys who submitted testimony for a hearing last week of the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission.

[Written Testimony submitted to the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission on the rule of law in China, Oct. 29, 2009]

### ON THE RELIGIOUS CASE IN SHANXI AND THE STATUS OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IN CHINA

(By Mr. Dai Jinbo)

#### I. THE STATUS OF CHINA'S RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IN RECENT YEARS

Since the release of the Regulations on Religious Affairs (hereafter abbreviated as Regulations) by China's State Council in 2004, house churches and other unregistered religious organizations have all been regarded as illegal by the ruling administration. House churches that do not want to join TSPM (Three-Self Patriotic Movement) churches, due to disagreement concerning their beliefs, have become targeted because they refuse to acquire administrative approval by registering their house church as a religious organization. The Regulations have become the basis for government departments to carry out selective law enforcement on unregistered religious organizations including house churches. This is also a result of China's institutionalization of religious issues.

Therefore, with the official implementation of the Regulations in 2005, house churches in various places have all faced or have experienced being banned, fined and/or requested to suspend their religious activities by the government. This can cause such administrative sanctions against them on the grounds that they are not registered. In terms of banning, there are various kinds of different rulings authorizing the ban. These rulings include administrative penalties meted out by the religion management departments to ban illegal religious organizations, ban illegal venues for religious activities and ban illegal Bible training workshops. The religious affairs departments also manage civil affairs departments and use their capacity as a governing entity for social organizations and religious organizations to ban and crack down on house churches on grounds that they are illegal social organizations. An example is the persecution experienced by the Autumn Rain Church in Chengdu in June 2009. Even public security agencies would also interfere in the internal affairs of religious organizations and prevent them from making progress towards autonomy. Further evidence of this type of religious persecution is the case in Baixiang, Wenzhou, in March 2009.

While the Chinese government was attempting to control and crack down on unregistered religious organizations, including house churches, these unregistered religious organizations did not succumb. Instead, they took the path of defending their rights in accordance with Chinese law. By defending their rights, they have exposed the Chinese government's violation of the rule of law and the principle of human rights. While cracking down on unregistered religious organizations on grounds that they are not registered, it is a violation of the international